



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,871	11/21/2003	Richard M. Edwards	306117	3053

7590 05/26/2009
Mark R. Kendrick
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
Suite 2800
725 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, ALLEN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/26/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,871

Applicant(s)

EDWARDS ET AL.

Examiner

Allen H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5, 6, 9, 13, 14, 17-22, 26, 28-30, 35, 39 and 40 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-6, 9, 13-14, 17-22, 26, 28-30, 35, 39-40 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-848)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/12/2009 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicants' election with traverse of Species IV (claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 13-14, 17-22, 26, 28-30) in the reply filed on 09/27/2007 is acknowledged. Claims 2-4, 36-38 belong to the other Species as pointed out in the original restriction requirement mailed on 8/16/2007, and are therefore withdrawn from consideration.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 02/12/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. With respect to applicants' argument that "Cherry does not disclose, teach or suggest the method of " the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client,

Art Unit: 2625

wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters”.

In reply: Hower '434 does not explicitly show the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Garcia '423. In particular, Garcia '423 teaches the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client (i.e., the user inputs the details of the print job such as the destination e-mail addresses/communication protocol, the subject of the print job, any message to be delivered to the job receiver etc. All of these show or indicate the existing information of the print job; see col. 5, lines 14-18), wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters (i.e., the indicator comprising an e-mail address /communication protocol corresponding to the job receiver, the job receiver being an entity to accept the print job for printing; see col. 5, lines 14-18 and col. 10, lines 30-35, fig. 2, not used to determine media selection parameters).

In view of the above, having the system of Hower and then given the well-established teaching of Garcia, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hower as taught by Garcia to include: receiving, at a printer, a print job including a print client indicator, the print client indicator being existing

Art Unit: 2625

information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters, since Garcia stated in col. 1, lines 30-50 that such a modification would ensure relating to printing accuracy problems and orienting to the reliable and secure transfer of documents using the Internet network.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 5-6, 9, 13-14, 35, 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. (US 5,467,434) in view of Garcia et al. (US 7,474,423).

Regarding claim 1, Hower '434 discloses a method of determining final media selection parameters (i.e., the combination of print job selections corresponds with the combination of printer properties available at the selected printer; see Abstract, fig. 8), comprising:

Receiving (Client/Server Job Ticket 35, fig. 2), at a printer (12-N, fig. 2), a print job including a print client indicator (i.e., a job ticket is combined with the mask / indicator so that the print selections available at the printer corresponding

Art Unit: 2625

to the selected print queue are displayed; see col. 2, lines 28-31 and col. 8, lines 20-25, figs. 3, 14A-14C),

comparing the print client indicator (i.e., a set of rules; col. 5, lines 19-25, fig. 14A-14C) to a plurality of entries in a mapping module (i.e., a comparison of these parameters with the decision tree 76 indicates that a permissible combination of print job selections has been programmed; Col. 7, lines 28-30, fig. 11);

determining if a matching entry including the print client indicator (i.e., a set of rules can be provided for each of the TRUE and FALSE states comprising an empty set of finishing options; see col. 8, lines 20-25, figs. 14A-14C) exists in the mapping module (fig. 8, 66-N);

determining if the matching entry includes media selection parameters (Yes, Send job to Print Queue, fig. 8, 72-N);

outputting at least one of the media selection parameters as one of the final media selection parameters if the matching entry exists in the mapping module (i.e., the corresponding job ticket 35 is transmitted to one of the print queues 42; Col. 7, lines 31-32, fig. 2).

Howser '434 does not explicitly show the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Garcia '423. In particular, Garcia '423 teaches the print

Art Unit: 2625

client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client (i.e., the user inputs the details of the print job such as the destination e-mail addresses/communication protocol, the subject of the print job, any message to be delivered to the job receiver etc. All of these show or indicate the existing information of the print job; see col. 5, lines 14-18), wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters (i.e., the indicator comprising an e-mail address /communication protocol corresponding to the job receiver, the job receiver being an entity to accept the print job for printing; see col. 5, lines 14-18 and col. 10, lines 30-35, fig. 2, not used to determine media selection parameters).

In view of the above, having the system of Hower and then given the well-established teaching of Garcia, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hower as taught by Garcia to include: the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters, since Garcia stated in col. 1, lines 30-50 that such a modification would ensure relating to printing accuracy problems and orienting to the reliable and secure transfer of documents using the Internet network.

Regarding claim 5, Hower '434 discloses the method, wherein the print client indicator is a text attribute (i.e., the client/server job ticket 35 may assume an ASCII format; Col. 4, lines 13-15, fig. 3).

Regarding claim 6, Hower '434 discloses the method, wherein the text attribute is one of a queue name (i.e., a combination of printing selections is programmed on the user interface and transmitted to a selected one of the print queues; Col. 2, lines 22-25, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 9, Hower '434 discloses a program code storage device (37, fig. 2), comprising:

a machine-readable storage medium (storage in a memory section of the combination examiner 37, col. 7, line 15);

machine-readable program code, stored on the machine-readable storage medium, having instructions, which when executed cause a multi-media printer (i.e., the media description parameters are represented by nodes and each node is coded appropriately for storage in a memory section of the combination examiner 37; Col. 7, lines 13-16, fig. 2) to:

receiving (Client/Server Job Ticket 35, fig. 2), at a printer (12-N, fig. 2), a print job including a print client indicator (i.e., a job ticket is combined with the mask / indicator so that the print selections available at the printer corresponding to the selected print queue are displayed; see col. 2, lines 28-31 and col. 8, lines 20-25, figs. 3, 14A-14C),

Art Unit: 2625

compare the print client indicator (i.e., a set of rules; col. 5, lines 19-25, fig. 14A-14C) to a plurality of entries in a mapping module (i.e., a comparison of these parameters with the decision tree 76 indicates that a permissible combination of print job selections has been programmed; Col. 7, lines 28-30, fig. 11);

determine if a matching entry including the print client indicator (i.e., a set of rules can be provided for each of the TRUE and FALSE states comprising an empty set of finishing options; see col. 8, lines 20-25, figs. 14A-14C) exists in the mapping module (fig. 8, 66-N);

determine if the matching entry includes media selection parameters (Yes, Send job to Print Queue, fig. 8, 72-N);

output one of the media selection parameters as one of the final media selection parameters if the matching entry exists in the mapping module (i.e., the corresponding job ticket 35 is transmitted to one of the print queues 42; Col. 7, lines 31-32, fig. 2).

Howser '434 does not explicitly show the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Garcia '423. In particular, Garcia '423 teaches the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client (i.e., the user inputs the details of

Art Unit: 2625

the print job such as the destination e-mail addresses/ communication protocol, the subject of the print job, any message to be delivered to the job receiver etc. All of these show or indicate the existing information of the print job; see col. 5, lines 14-18), wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters (i.e., the indicator comprising an e-mail address /communication protocol corresponding to the job receiver, the job receiver being an entity to accept the print job for printing; see col. 5, lines 14-18 and col. 10, lines 30-35, fig. 2).

In view of the above, having the system of Hower and then given the well-established teaching of Garcia, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hower as taught by Garcia to include: the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters, since Garcia stated in col. 1, lines 30-50 that such a modification would ensure relating to printing accuracy problems and orienting to the reliable and secure transfer of documents using the Internet network.

Regarding claim 13, Hower '434 discloses the program code storage device (37, fig. 2), wherein the print client indicator is a text attribute (i.e., the client/server job ticket 35 may assume an ASCII format; Col. 4, lines 13-15, fig.

3).

Regarding claim 14, Hower '434 discloses the program code storage device (37, fig. 2), wherein the text attribute is one of a queue (i.e., a combination of printing selections is programmed on the user interface and transmitted to a selected one of the print queues; Col. 2, lines 22-25, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 35, Hower '434 discloses a method of determining final media selection parameters, comprising:

Receiving (Client/Server Job Ticket 35, fig. 2), at a printer (12-N, fig. 2), a print job including a print client indicator (i.e., a job ticket is combined with the mask / indicator so that the print selections available at the printer corresponding to the selected print queue are displayed; see col. 2, lines 28-31 and col. 8, lines 20-25, figs. 3, 14A-14C),

comparing the print client indicator (i.e., a set of rules; col. 5, lines 19-25, fig. 14A-14C) to a plurality of entries in a mapping module (i.e., a comparison of these parameters with the decision tree 76 indicates that a permissible combination of print job selections has been programmed; Col. 7, lines 28-30, fig. 11);

determining if a matching entry including the print client indicator (i.e., a set of rules can be provided for each of the TRUE and FALSE states comprising an empty set of finishing options; see col. 8, lines 20-25, figs. 14A-14C) exists in the mapping module (fig. 8, 66-N);

determining if the matching entry includes media selection parameters
(Yes, Send job to Print Queue, fig. 8, 72-N);

outputting at least one of the media selection parameters as one of the
final media selection parameters if the matching entry exists in the mapping
module (i.e., the corresponding job ticket 35 is transmitted to one of the print
queues 42; Col. 7, lines 31-32, fig. 2).

Hower '434 does not explicitly show the print client indicator being existing
information within the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information
is typically not used to determine media selection parameters.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the
art as evidenced by Garcia '423. In particular, Garcia '423 teaches the print
client indicator being existing information within the print job from a print client
(i.e., the user inputs the details of the print job such as the destination e-mail
addresses, the subject of the print job, any message to be delivered to the job
receiver etc. All of these show or indicate the existing information of the print job;
see col. 5, lines 14-18), wherein the existing information is typically not used to
determine media selection parameters (i.e., the indicator comprising an e-mail
address corresponding to the job receiver, the job receiver being an entity to
accept the print job for printing; see col. 5, lines 14-18 and col. 10, lines 30-35,
fig. 2).

In view of the above, having the system of Hower and then given the well-
established teaching of Garcia, it would have been obvious to one having
ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the

Art Unit: 2625

system of Hower as taught by Garcia to include: the print client indicator being existing information within the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters, since Garcia stated in col. 1, lines 30-50 that such a modification would ensure relating to printing accuracy problems and orienting to the reliable and secure transfer of documents using the Internet network.

Regarding claim 39, Hower '434 discloses the method, wherein the text attribute is one of a queue name (i.e., a combination of printing selections is programmed on the user interface and transmitted to a selected one of the print queues; Col. 2, lines 22-25, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 40, Hower '434 discloses the method, wherein the text attribute is one of a queue name (i.e., a combination of printing selections is programmed on the user interface and transmitted to a selected one of the print queues; Col. 2, lines 22-25, fig. 2).

6. Claims 17-18, 26, 28, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. (US 5,467,434) in view of Garcia et al. (US 7,474,423), and further in view of Reilly (US 6,502,147).

Regarding claim 17, Hower '434 discloses a multi-media printer (Printer 12-N, fig. 2), comprising:

Art Unit: 2625

a decoding module (Print Queues 42-N, fig. 2) to receive the submitted print job ("decision trees" through use of a suitable pyramid coding technique, col. 6, line 50, figs. 6A-6B) and to extract at least one print client indicator from the submitted print job (i.e., the media description parameters are combined in the printer profile to facilitate parsing of the printer profile into one or more decision trees; Col. 6, lines 51-53);

a mapping module (Printer Profile 44-N, fig. 2) including a plurality of entries (the organization of parameters into one or more decision trees, col. 6, lines 66-67), each of the plurality of entries including at least one print client indicator and a corresponding media selection parameter (i.e., the parameters for any given printer profile could be organized into any sort of link list(s) having a suitable hierarchical structure; Col. 7, lines 1-2);

a parameter determination module (43, fig. 2) to receive the at least one print client indicator from the decoding module (fig. 8, 66-N), to compare the at least one print client indicator to the plurality of entries in the mapping module (i.e., a comparison of these parameters with the decision tree 76 indicates that a permissible combination of print job selections has been programmed; Col. 7, lines 28-30, fig. 11) to determine if a matching entry corresponds to the at least one print client indicator (Yes, Send job to Print Queue, fig. 8, 72-N), and to output at least one media selection parameter as one of the final media selection parameters if the matching entry is found in the mapping table (i.e., the corresponding job ticket 35 is transmitted to one of the print queues 42; Col. 7, lines 31-32, fig. 2).

Hower '434 does not explicitly show the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Garcia '423. In particular, Garcia '423 teaches the print client indicator (i.e., a print job comprising one or more print files and an indicator of one or more job receivers to a remote printing server; see Abstract) being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client (i.e., the user inputs the details of the print job such as the destination e-mail addresses, the subject of the print job, any message to be delivered to the job receiver etc. All of these show or indicate the existing information of the print job; see col. 5, lines 14-18), wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters (i.e., the indicator comprising an e-mail address corresponding to the job receiver, the job receiver being an entity to accept the print job for printing; see col. 5, lines 14-18 and col. 10, lines 30-35, fig. 2).

In view of the above, having the system of Hower and then given the well-established teaching of Garcia, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hower as taught by Garcia to include: the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to

Art Unit: 2625

determine media selection parameters, since Garcia stated in col. 1, lines 30-50 that such a modification would ensure relating to printing accuracy problems and orienting to the reliable and secure transfer of documents using the Internet network.

The combination of Hower '434 and Garcia '423 does not explicitly show a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Reilly '147. In particular, Reilly '147 teaches a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job (i.e., print servers and a printer may be combined in the same machine on many networks for economical reasons; Col. 2, lines 42-45).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Hower and Garcia and then given the well-established teaching of Reilly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hower and Garcia as taught by Reilly to include: a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job, since Reilly stated in col. 1, lines 25-30 that such a modification would ensure the network printer is a stand-alone peripheral device which is desired to perform in an increasing number of network and non-network communication environments. In network environments, the printer is desired to provide "seamless plug and play" connectivity for the continuous expansion of network service protocol/ports.

Regarding claim 18, Hower '434 discloses the multi-media printer (Printer 12-N, fig. 2), wherein the mapping module is stored on a mass storage device (i.e., a combination of printer properties provided in the stored printer profile; Col. 4, lines 54-55).

The combination of Hower '434 and Garcia does not disclose the mass storage device with the mapping module is internal to the multi-media printer.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Reilly '147. In particular, Reilly '147 teaches the printer server of Hower '434 could be internal to the multi-media printer (i.e., print servers and a printer may be combined in the same machine on many networks for economical reasons; Col. 2, lines 42-45).

In view of the above, having the system of Hower and Garcia and then given the well-established teaching of Reilly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hower and Garcia as taught by Reilly to include: the mass storage device with the mapping module is internal to the multi-media printer, since Reilly stated in col. 1, lines 25-30 that such a modification would ensure the network printer is a stand-alone peripheral device which is desired to perform in an increasing number of network and non-network communication environments. In network environments, the printer is desired to provide "seamless plug and play" connectivity for the continuous expansion of network service protocol/ports.

Regarding claim 26, Hower '434 discloses the multi-media printer, wherein the print client indicator is a text attribute (i.e., the client/server job ticket 35 may assume an ASCII format; Col. 4, lines 13-15, fig. 3).

Regarding claim 28, Hower '434 discloses a multi-media printer (Printer 12-N, fig. 2), comprising:

a decoding module (Print Queues 42-N, fig. 2) to receive the submitted print job ("decision trees" through use of a suitable pyramid coding technique, col. 6, line 50, figs. 6A-6B) and to extract at least one print client indicator from the submitted print job (i.e., the media description parameters are combined in the printer profile to facilitate parsing of the printer profile into one or more decision trees; Col. 6, lines 51-53);

a mapping module (Printer Profile 44-N, fig. 2) including a plurality of entries (the organization of parameters into one or more decision trees, col. 6, lines 66-67), each of the plurality of entries including at least one print client indicator and a corresponding job settings file (i.e., the parameters for any given printer profile could be organized into any sort of link list(s) having a suitable hierarchical structure; Col. 7, lines 1-2),

a parameter determination module (43, fig. 2) to receive the at least one print client indicator from the decoding module (fig. 8, 66-N), to compare the at least one print client indicator to the plurality of entries in the mapping module (i.e., a comparison of these parameters with the decision tree 76 indicates that a permissible combination of print job selections has been programmed; Col. 7,

Art Unit: 2625

lines 28-30, fig. 11) to determine if a matching entry corresponds to the at least one print client indicator (Yes, Send job to Print Queue, fig. 8, 72-N), to determine if the job settings file in the matching entry includes at least one media selection parameter, to determine if the at least one media selection parameter is defined and operational (fig. 8, 66-N), and to output the at least one media selection parameter as one of the final media selection parameters if the job settings file in the matching entry is found in the mapping module (i.e., the corresponding job ticket 35 is transmitted to one of the print queues 42; Col. 7, lines 31-32, fig. 2).

Howser '434 does not explicitly show the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Garcia '423. In particular, Garcia '423 teaches the print client indicator (i.e., a print job comprising one or more print files and an indicator of one or more job receivers to a remote printing server; see Abstract) being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client (i.e., the user inputs the details of the print job such as the destination e-mail addresses, the subject of the print job, any message to be delivered to the job receiver etc. All of these show or indicate the existing information of the print job; see col. 5, lines 14-18), wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters (i.e.,

Art Unit: 2625

the indicator comprising an e-mail address corresponding to the job receiver, the job receiver being an entity to accept the print job for printing; see col. 5, lines 14-18 and col. 10, lines 30-35, fig. 2).

In view of the above, having the system of Hower and then given the well-established teaching of Garcia, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hower as taught by Garcia to include: the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters, since Garcia stated in col. 1, lines 30-50 that such a modification would ensure relating to printing accuracy problems and orienting to the reliable and secure transfer of documents using the Internet network.

The combination of Hower '434 and Garcia '423 does not explicitly show a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Reilly '147. In particular, Reilly '147 teaches a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job (i.e., print servers and a printer may be combined in the same machine on many networks for economical reasons; Col. 2, lines 42-45).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Hower and Garcia and then given the well-established teaching of Reilly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was

Art Unit: 2625

made to modify the system of Hower and Garcia as taught by Reilly to include: a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job, since Reilly stated in col. 1, lines 25-30 that such a modification would ensure the network printer is a stand-alone peripheral device which is desired to perform in an increasing number of network and non-network communication environments. In network environments, the printer is desired to provide "seamless plug and play" connectivity for the continuous expansion of network service protocol/ports.

Regarding claim 30, Garcia '423 teaches the multi-media printer (Printer 18, 18', figs. 1-2), wherein the print client indicator is one of a TCP port, a network identity (i.e., the indicator comprising an e-mail address corresponding to the job receiver, the job receiver being an entity to accept the print job for printing; see col. 5, lines 14-18 and col. 10, lines 30-35, figs. 1-2), a modality indicator, and a text attribute.

7. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. (US 5,467,434) in view of Garcia et al. (US 7,474,423), in view of Reilly (US 6,502,147), and further in view of Leone, III et al. (US 2003/0002081).

Regarding claim 19, the combination of Hower, Jr. '434, Garcia '423 and Reilly '147 does not explicitly show the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is stored on a removable memory device.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Leone '081. In particular, Leone '081 teaches the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is stored on a removable memory device (i.e., a data template stored in the printing apparatus provides a structure for specifying the printed format of the data transmitted from the portable memory device; see Abstract).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Hower, Garcia and Reilly and then given the well-established teaching of Leone, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination system of Hower, Garcia and Reilly as taught by Leone to include: the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is stored on a removable memory device, since Leone stated on page 1, paragraph [0001] that such a modification would ensure a printing apparatus adapted to accept data transferred from a portable memory device, to format the data according to operator instructions, and to generate a personalized print item that utilizes the transferred data.

8. Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. (US 5,467,434) in view of Garcia et al. (US 7,474,423), in view of Reilly (US 6,502,147), and further in view of Yoneda et al. (US 6,564,337).

Regarding claim 20, the combination of Hower, Jr. '434, Garcia '423 and Reilly '147 does not disclose the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated via an operation panel of the multi-media printer.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Yoneda '337. In particular, Yoneda '337 teaches the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated via an operation panel of the multi-media printer (i.e., the operation panel control program 21 of printer 20 updates the IP address that is stored in port setting information 22(S61); Col. 5, lines 47-49, figs. 1, 6).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Hower, Garcia and Reilly and then given the well-established teaching of Yoneda, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination system of Hower, Garcia and Reilly as taught by Yoneda to include: the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated via an operation panel of the multi-media printer, since Yoneda stated in col. 1, lines 7-13 that such a modification would ensure a method of controlling communication between a plurality of devices such as personal computers or printers connected to a network, and, in particular, relates to a method of communication control in a network wherein communication is possible under a plurality of protocols.

Regarding claim 21, the combination of Hower '434, Garcia '423 and Reilly '147 does not explicitly show the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping

Art Unit: 2625

module is updated by transmitting a file in a pre-determined format to the multi-media printer.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Yoneda '337. In particular, Yoneda '337 teaches the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a file in a pre-determined format to the multi-media printer (i.e., when the UDP communication control program 13 of personal computer 10 receives the response message from printer 20 (S74), it compares the IP address corresponding to the MAC address of printer 20 that is set in the IP/MAC correspondence table of communication destination information 12 with the IP address contained in the response message and, if these are different, updates this to the IP address contained in the response message (S75); Col. 7, lines 40-50, fig. 7).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Hower, Garcia and Reilly and then given the well-established teaching of Yoneda, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination system of Hower, Garcia and Reilly as taught by Yoneda to include: the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a file in a pre-determined format to the multi-media printer, since Yoneda stated in col. 1, lines 7-13 that such a modification would ensure a method of controlling communication between a plurality of devices such as personal computers or printers connected to a network, and, in

Art Unit: 2625

particular, relates to a method of communication control in a network wherein communication is possible under a plurality of protocols.

9. Claims 22, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. (US 5,467,434) in view of Garcia et al. (US 7,474,423), in view of Reilly (US 6,502,147), and further in view of Lee (US 2003/0226139).

Regarding claim 22, the combination of Hower, Jr. '434, Garcia '423 and Reilly '147 does not explicitly show the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a command from a print client.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Lee '139. In particular, Lee '139 teaches the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a command from a print client (i.e., the client computer then signals the network printer cause installation of the software update on the network printer; see Abstract).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Hower, Garcia and Reilly and then given the well-established teaching of Lee '139, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination system of Hower, Garcia and Reilly as taught by Lee to include: the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a command from a print client, since Lee stated on page 1, paragraph [0002] that such a modification would ensure a printer controller (or printer), which function is to control all printing functions on a related peripheral

Art Unit: 2625

output device, will sometimes require files to be loaded from external distribution means for the purpose of providing software upgrades, new software installations, and/or batch configurations.

Regarding claim 29, the combination of Hower, Jr. '434, Garcia '423 and Reilly '147 does not explicitly show the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by one of transmitting a command from a print client.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Lee '139. In particular, Lee '139 teaches the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a command from a print client (i.e., the client computer then signals the network printer cause installation of the software update on the network printer; see Abstract).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Hower, Garcia and Reilly and then given the well-established teaching of Lee, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination system of Hower, Garcia and Reilly as taught by Lee to include: the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by one of transmitting a command from a print client, since Lee stated on page 1, paragraph [0002] that such a modification would ensure a printer controller (or printer), which function is to control all printing functions on a related peripheral output device, will sometimes require files to be loaded from external distribution means for the purpose of providing software upgrades, new software installations, and/or batch configurations.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Watanabe (US 2002/0062364) discloses network device management method, system and management equipment thereof.

Nakamura (US 2002/0046312) discloses peripheral unit management system, method and program recording medium therefor.

Tokashiki (US 7,352,487) discloses print control system, print control method, memory medium, and program.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)270-1229. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM-6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KING Y. POON can be reached on (571) 272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/King Y. Poon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Allen H. Nguyen/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625